ICANN

Moderator: Benedetta Rossi
February 6, 2014
4 pm UTC

Coordinator: This is (Carol). The recordings are in. Thank you.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, (Carol). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the BC Members call taking place on the 6th of February, 2014.

On the call today we have Steve DelBianco, Janet O'Callaghan, (Stephanie Duchanel), Angie Graves, Ron Andruff, Jim Baskin, Yvette Miller, Philip Corwin and Adobe Connect we have Gabriella Szlak, Jimson Olufuye and Tim Chen.

We have apologies from Elisa Cooper, Laura Covington and Marie Pattullo. I would like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, (Bennie). So I'll chair today's call in the absence of Elisa. And I hope I can match her performance of making sure we're done within an hour.

Right up front the agenda itself calls for an extensive discussion by the participants on this cross community working group, those include Aparna, Marilyn, David Farris and Phil Corwin. I think at this point we only have - of that group we only have Corwin on the line. So...

Laura Covington: Laura's here.

Steve DelBianco: Oh great. And then we may end up deferring that to later in the call to see if we can get Aparna to join and Marilyn Cade.

Now before we dive into the agenda, though, I did want to ask (Bennie) to give all of you just an update, a reminder, about the elections process that we've set in motion to nominate and then elect the next round of officers for the Business Constituency.

So, (Bennie), just remind everybody of the timeline and process.

Benedetta Rossi: Sure, just for the record, my apologies, John, I missed that John Berard is on the Adobe Connect as well. He's just joined from the Adobe and I didn't announce them on a roll call.

So the timeline for the 2014 BC officer election the nomination period of two weeks began on 30 January and will finish on Thursday, February 13 so basically in one week.

Candidate statements will be - need to be sent to me by 17 February, which is the day before the candidate's call, which will take place on February 18. For any VC member who won't be able to participate on the call the call will be recorded and transcribed and will be posted to all members.

Electronic voting will start on 19 February for one week until the 26th. I will count the votes as voting officer and then have them validated by the returning officer and verifying officer on the 27th. And the announcement of the results will take place by February 28 so basically right at the end of the month.

I'm sorry, Steve, was there anything else you wanted me to run over was it just the timeline?

Steve DelBianco: The timeline and process and eligibility. Are there any questions from members of the BC on what Benedetta just went over? Thanks. I'd like to make one offer in that if any of you harbor even a tiny interest at trying a run at the policy coordination chair or any of the other offices all of the current officers will be more than happy to brief you on how we do our job, what kind of requirements is, efficiencies that we've used to reduce the amount of time it takes.

Because it would be great to get fresh blood into the officer corps if anybody shows any level of interest. If you are not quite ready to step up and share something there's plenty of other opportunities to participate as many of you have. Any questions on the elections?

Okay I'm going to jump next to the agenda which calls for us covering the community working group on Internet governance. And BC has for designated reps, Aparna, Marilyn, David Farris and Phil Corwin. At this point we only have - of that group we only have one member on the call.

And so I think that I will juggle the agenda and quickly ran through the policy update hoping that Marilyn or Aparna will join the call. (Bennie), if it's possible to send a quick email to Aparna and Marilyn...

((Crosstalk))

Benedetta Rossi: Aparna has just joined the AC room, by the way so I presume that she might be joining the audio is shortly.

Steve DelBianco: Okay well if Aparna and Phil are here if I don't we...

((Crosstalk))

Benedetta Rossi: And Marilyn just joined as well on the audio.

Steve DelBianco: That's great. Okay. So, Marilyn, Phil and Aparna, we're looking to turn to you next; we have a 20-minute segment here for you to update your fellow BC members on the process and what's ahead for your cross community working group on Internet governance.

There's been some traffic on the BC list and I appreciate you keeping us involved but this is a great chance for you to go over that and take questions from members. Phil, you've been here first do you want to kick us off please?

Phil Corwin: Actually Steve, Marilyn's been - I've missed some calls that Marilyn was on and she's got a broader view so she's - wants to start first I think that might be better and then I can chime in in particular about what's been announced most recently regard to planning for the Brazil meeting.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Marilyn, over to you.

Marilyn Cade: I'm happy to but I just want to note that Aparna and I were just on another call so I don't want to in any way preempt but if I could divide our conversation

into focusing on the CCWG activity, the ICANN Cross Community Working Group activity and to the larger background issues - I don't want to call them noise, that's not what I mean, but the larger background issues related to the Internet ecosystem of activities and then the Brazilian meeting.

So maybe I'll start with a - tomorrow morning at 3:00 am in the morning Eastern Standard Time, which works - I hope I'm being transcribed so everyone's going to laugh when I say this - 3:00 am in the morning Eastern Standard Time is perfect for me. It means I'm not on some other call. That's a joke, guys.

But 3:00 am in the morning or 2:00 am in the morning for anybody from any region of the world is a problem. We are doing our best but right now the CCWG is really struggling with having time slots that allow broad participation.

We will have a call tomorrow morning. On our last call we agreed that the Monday time slot following the CO's stance on (unintelligible) would be supported by a 90 minute outreach session that the CCWG would coordinate with the community. So it would be basically a consultation with the broad set of stakeholders.

We - I sent something off on this to the list. And I don't want to preempt what Aparna is going to be able to contribute but the point is right now the advice from the CCWG is a 90 minute session on Monday, which means the GAC can be in the audience, we can all be in the audience. And there's no substantive discussion yet so now we need to be thinking about what the substantive discussion is.

Within the CCWG there's a range of abuse. Generally the view is that Fadi is making a lot of decisions and is not yet fully incorporated or taking consultation from the community. But the CCWG hasn't figured out how they organize that input. So that meeting in Singapore is going to be important meeting.

There is also a one-day Friday event organized by the NCUC supported by the ICANN staff, without any consultation with anyone else, to hold a meeting that they will invite panelists to. And I think we should just park the information about that session and come back to who on the BC will be able to travel to attend that meeting.

But general consensus of the CCWG seems to be that that Monday consultation should be one that community expresses its views to Fadi and the Board.

I don't want to -I will come back later and talk about the Brazil meeting or the larger ecosystem meeting. But CCWG is such a priority I think in how the community provides input to ICANN that I don't want to minimize it.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, it's Steve. Does the CCWG have a wiki on the ICANN Website or an email list that any of us can observe?

Marilyn Cade: They do. We have both. And maybe, (Bennie), if you can help me we'll get that information out to the BC.

Benedetta Rossi: Yes of course.

Steve DelBianco: And for Marilyn's question are there any other members of the BC who thought they would be in Singapore on the Friday before the meeting begins in order to attend and participate at the NCUC?

Ron Andruff: This is Ron. For all intents and purposes I could get in a day early to attend that.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: I'm expecting to be there as well and Bill Drake had invited me to be a panelist on that Friday; I don't know what panel and for how long but I agreed. Anyone else?

Jim Baskin: This is Jim Baskin. I can try to be there. I haven't made my final reservations yet so it's possible.

Steve DelBianco: Great. And, Gabby, it is the Friday prior to the weekend meeting. ICANN meeting has a way of expanding.

Phil Corwin: And, Steve, Phil here. I expect to be in Singapore on that day. And Bill Drake has been in contact; he may want me to participate on a panel there. I'm not sure what focus.

Steve DelBianco: Excellent. And, Marilyn, I presume you may also get there early?

Marilyn Cade: I am planning on attending but I would prefer not to be a panelist and to have other BC members take a panelist seat because I'm on the CCWG along with a few others and so my preference is not to take a panelist seat on a Friday.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Aparna, your hand's up and you're one of our four key reps. Take it off.

Aparna Sridhar: Yeah, so I missed a little bit of the conversation just because I was having some difficulties with the phone. But I think we really have an opportunity here to advance the key principles that we think are important. I thought the response to the five-year strategic plan was an important first start.

But I had circulated an email around to folks who were interested listing the sort of key topics that I thought we ought to develop some positions on and asked for any volunteers to sort of start drafting positions on these key topics.

But I didn't hear anything at all from anyone so, you know, I'm happy to kind of take all of them on but I don't think that's the best way to do this. So wondering if folks who are on that list who had expressed interest are willing or if we should try a different approach. I'm open to a different approach too. I just - right now I feel like we're doing a lot of talking and not a lot of actual sort of development of positions.

Steve DelBianco: The four of you that kindly volunteered to represent the BC would be the first labor pool to dip into for that. But, you're right, all the rest of us have a stake in this issue and should be able to help. Is it possible to display those were quickly circulate your email to the list?

Aparna Sridhar: Yeah, let me just - I'll - I can put this into the Chat - the four topics I suggested.

((Crosstalk))

Aparna Sridhar: And then I had put names next to them just like based on what - oops.

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: With apologies. Could we maybe post that to the entire list because I think many members are...

Aparna Sridhar: Yeah, so I sent it to BC private on January 21. I can resend.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Could we forward that? Because I suspect after new news a lot of members may have renewed interest.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah, I hope so. And please, Aparna, Phil and Marilyn, use this segment to give the bigger picture and we'll take questions from members. Aparna, go on.

Aparna Sridhar: Yeah, so I really think the thing we need to focus on are the working group on Internet governance and 1net. I also listed the strategy panel and the (assist) panel on Internet governance.

But what I would - just - is we should come up with, within the BC, and I'm happy to take this on just a couple of short bullet points on both of those things - obviously they are related - to just give a sense of where the Business Constituency is, you know, support for the multi-stakeholder model.

You know, I think we should - and we can discuss this - I think we should have a recognition that the model needs to be - to evolve and to be more inclusive of stakeholders in the developing world. Like we need to have started an openness to discuss with governments whether or not the structure has changed. So those would be some of the key topics that I would touch on.

I'm happy to take a crack at it and then, you know, if everyone, you know, feels distressed by what I write we can revisit. But it sounds like the time is right to at least start thinking about this stuff. And I'm also happy to have help.

Marilyn Cade: So it's Marilyn. Maybe we could get (Bennie) to schedule a call with the four of us and anyone else who is critically interested in. But I just want to introduce, Aparna, the fifth panel - I think the fifth panel is something we need to build on from what Aparna said.

My own view is we need to be understanding what the fifth panel thinks it's doing. But we also need to be understanding and watching and contributing to the other four panels.

For those of - Steve, we're going to come to this later but I'm going to flag it right now, Beth Novak's panel proposes (cross-listing) for making policy input and policy decisions.

I think we need to be thinking about all five panels with a priority perhaps Internet governance for the fifth panel. But all - the other four panels are also really critically (unintelligible) unless we pay attention.

Steve DelBianco: Aparna your hand's still up.

Aparna Sridhar: Yeah, so this is Aparna. I actually think, you know, I support the idea of having calls but the last few calls we have just discussed and need to have positions. And we really need to just bite the bullet and start doing work. So I'm happy to do that work; I'm happy to take a crack at it at least with respect to the two topics I suggested, which are the working group and the 1net ListServ.

And I'll circulate that stuff to Marilyn and to Phil who - and to Steve if you're interested. Anyone else who's interested just let me know. But, look, I think the calls are not really driving us into a decision making process or into a content generation process. They're sort of circular. And I know we all have a lot on our plates so I'm just not sure another call is a way to go forward.

Steve DelBianco: Let me suggest that once you put some bullet points associated with each of the four topic areas, send it to all of BC private...

Aparna Sridhar: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...and then invite responses to put some meat on those bones, agree or disagree. But give a two or three day timeframe on that. And that helps to...

Aparna Sridhar: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...draw members in. Because, as you know, so many times on these calls not everybody can attend. We do try to run them briskly so it is better for folks to respond to something that they see in writing even if it's just a proposition or a straw man.

Aparna Sridhar: Happy to.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Phil Corwin, over to you.

Phil Corwin: Yes, Steve, a couple of quick comments on this general topic. One in regard to that Beth Novak panel and, you know, I posted an email a few days ago regarding that.

And I think what's particularly of note for the BC and other constituencies is besides the crowd sourcing, which I derisively called "mob sourcing" - but that's a personal view - they propose consideration of setting up a parallel process looking toward the possibility of doing away with interest group constituencies like the BC and replacing that with basically one-off issue constituencies brought together on particular issues. So I think that's a very serious issue for us to consider.

Moving on to the CCWG and the 1net; CCWG is still trying to figure out a charter. And I agree with what Aparna just said, they're no where close to coming up with coherent consensus positions.

1net, I admit, I try to follow what's going on on that mail list but I've got too much else going on in my professional and personal life to read either one. But the current state of plays there - basically it's not an organization, it's just a mailing list and it's all over the place in terms of topics being discussed and positions and expertise.

And I'm not - I don't see a real well-organized effort going on there where 1net is really, even though on the press releases they're having a role in Brazil I'm not sure how real that role is but others can voice in on that.

The last thing I wanted to note was I had circulated a link - I did publish an article three days ago analyzing the information put out by the first meeting of the executive multistakeholder committee which was on January 27. They're the ones really planning the Brazil meeting.

And just a couple key items to note, one, they're now talking about a total attendance of around 700 rather than the originally envisioned 1000 plus. And based on a comment made at the State of the Net last week that seems to be

because they've - they originally considered the Trans America Hotel and now it's going to be in the Hyatt and this seems to be based on a much smaller meeting room. So the attendance has been cut by about 1/3 by the organizers.

Second, the main topics are going to continue to be Internet governance principles and road map for further evolution of the governance ecosystem. But they're also looking at possibly considering human rights which can bring in anything as a topic of discussion.

And there's going to be - and of course internationalization of - they say of every aspect of Internet governance which would include the IANA function, which if they discuss that there's no way of discussing ICANN.

The other things are that the - let me see. Yeah, they're not going to invite attendees, which I think is a big surprise. Instead they're going to have a system where individuals have to write in and express expressions of interest.

And if they get more than 700 expressions of interest or, you know, and then there's going to look at dividing, you know, each group into - the attendance is going to be divided between government, where they envision 200 attendees, civil society, private sector, academic and technical community and international organizations. If they get more than 700 overall or more than the allotment for each of those categories they're going to decide who can actually attend in person by some method they haven't outlined yet.

But I think the key takeaway here is that outside groups won't be able to select representatives. Directly they can say well, you know, you folks should write in on behalf of all of us and ask to attend. But they're not going to - different groups won't be able to propose a coherent delegation to be invited. Instead

you're going to have to participate in this request to attend system they're going to have.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Phil, this is Steve. I might note that your expressions of interest are due by February the 28th. I don't know if it matters how soon one gets it in. But both you and your Marilyn, in your communications, put the link to that for BC members. It's...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...dotBR and that hyperlink is in your piece as well as Marilyn's email.

Phil Corwin: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...expression of interest includes...

Phil Corwin: And there'll be no funding to fund anybody to attend so anybody who wants to go is going to have to fund it them - self fund or have someone paying their way. And besides the February 28 deadline for sending in expressions of interest the drop dead deadline for input to shape the agenda is March 1 so for both 1net and CCWG where it's basically - there's three weeks left to formally propose how the agenda should be focused.

And then it kind of closes down and the organizing committees are going to base final decisions on that. And finally the actual format of the meeting will be - there'll be no sub groups. Everybody will be meeting for two days in one large room. There'll be a total of 8 hours of sessions divided between the pathway and the evolution - the evolution and the principles and then there'll be one two-hour concluding.

So how 700 people who are not previously organized and get together in a big room and work out all that stuff over two days I'm not sure. And I'm not sure how much between March 1 and the actual meeting will be devoted to, you know, communications among those who've been accepted to attend to try to develop some kind of draft positions to be discussed in Brazil or, you know, I'm just not sure how much preparatory work will go on with this. All I know is that...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: And at the meeting yourself you were there when I asked Fadi last week here in Washington about decisions being taken because Fadi claimed that an outcome of the Brazil meeting would be a set of principles to guide all the subsequent meetings over the rest of the year.

And I asked, how does one agree upon a set of principles without some method or process or rules for voting? And that point the assured everyone in the room there would be no votes and no decisions taken in Brazil. So we'll have to wait and see.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...Jim Baskin's in the queue...

Marilyn Cade: And it's Marilyn, I'd like to...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Great.

Marilyn Cade: I'd like to get in the queue, yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Great. So for BC members this is a great chance to ask some questions of these folks. So I have Jim Baskin and Marilyn. Go ahead, Jim.

Jim Baskin: Yeah, I'm just - I'm afraid that the time between March 1 and the meeting is going to be spent writing the conclusions rather than planning an agenda.

Steve DelBianco: Entirely possible.

Jim Baskin: I hope...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Let me add a - maybe a few more factoids as I can. There are four committees planning the Brazilian meeting. One of the committees is a high level meeting that has three participants in it. I've said that on email before but I'm just going to quickly cover it. (Joelle Duff) and (Christoph Seck) and Jimson Olufuye. You will all recognize Jimson Olufuye's name. He was just recently added to that group.

It's unclear what their role is. And they are striving to have a engagement because when you read what the description is - and I want to be careful here, I don't want us to divert the Business Constituency away from what we can affect. And I don't want us to think that we are, you know, if we want - we need to figure out do we want ICANN to have a limited role then we need to define that limited role. But I just am going to provide facts.

So that committee is describing - they've not yet met - they will be defining high level approval and participation in the event. The second committee, which has Zahid Jamil on it from the Business community and will soon be joined by someone to replace Zahid, that committee is planning what documents are received, how to deal with documents, how to assess the documents, how to put forward documents into the two-day event. That's a very critical group.

Third committee is the logistics committee. And that is not going to have someone from Business in it I don't think. It's all about, you know, logistics, logistics, logistics. Civil society has agreed to accept that seat. And probably - this is just my personal view - not in business's interest to worry about that because civil society people names being put forward are very, very inclusive.

The fourth committee is the governments. We now have nine governments announced. There are no Africans. There are no Caribbeans. There are no - the only Latin are Argentina and Brazil. Peru, Chile, Mexico and Columbia have asked to be included and have not been acknowledged. So

So, you know, we're the Business Constituency at ICANN. I don't want to overwhelm us with all this extraneous information. I think it's important but I don't want to - Steve, I don't want to make it more than what the BC members want to hear and engage in.

But I would say the following: I said on a recent post, "Sign up for the Brazilian meeting." Sign up. Just send in an expression of interest. And then you can figure out the rest of the process - we'll figure out how we make sure we have balanced participation.

But I would strongly encourage all BC members to just do that simple thing; indicate your expression of interest.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: How simple it is depends on what you do when you fill in the box of up to 700 words where you indicate the reason for your attendance. And one guess is that if they're oversubscribed they may well look at that to determine who gets booted. So I wish it were as simple as your name and address.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, Steve, it's very likely that the 1net team is going to be asked to provide principles on if we get over-subscription. But I want to say one more thing. The last - sorry, the first (unintelligible) meeting, the only business person who showed up was me. Pause. Pause. Pause.

The next meeting had Chip Sharp and me and Aparna, I think, participating. The point is we're going to struggle to get enough business people to come to this meeting. But right now please sign up with an expression of interest. Even if you can't come, express your interest.

Steve DelBianco: Good report, Marilyn. We're running way long on this segment so let me turn to Ron and then Aparna and then we'll move on. Go ahead, Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you, Steve. Ron for the record - Ron Andruff. My concern is that as I'm hearing these reports on Internet governance and all of the minutiae that are completely distracting us from what we should be doing, both as ICANN and as a constituency, and seeing the strat plans and Aparna's call for help to work through those things, again, things that we as a community had no input whatsoever to; all of a sudden they were just thrust upon us, thrust upon the community.

So here we are we're all very busy trying to parse these documents, trying to figure out what these strat panels are doing. These panels are now basically force feeding what we need to be doing and how we're going to respond to it. It's very frustrating to me because I thought we actually as a - ICANN as a body has a program going on right now called the new gTLD program. There's new TLDs coming out.

There's all kinds of work and issues and problems that we had to resolve there. And we're completely distracted by that. I'm very, very frustrated as a member of the BC, I have to say, that I don't know exactly how or when we get a handle on this thing and try to get this course corrected but seems to me our CEO has been doing a fine job of baiting and switching on us, you know, really taking our attention off of the things that we should be focused on putting attention on things that we should have nothing to do with right now and they shouldn't even be happening.

So I just wanted to voice my disappointment by that. I'm sure many others feel the same way. And I think it's important that we find a way to get this message across to the CEO and to the Board that this is out of line. We're not focused on what we should be doing and it's only the biggest rollout of top level domains in the history of the Internet which may or may not fail

miserably. So that's the issue. Thank you. Thank you for taking - giving me the time.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Ron. The CEO has gone from mission creep to mission leap. Once again thanks to Phil, Marilyn and Aparna for your leadership on that CCWG. We're going to jump to the next segment of the agenda now, it's a quick update on policy. I'll bet I can get it done in under 10 minutes.

First I wanted to thank Andy Abrams and Stephanie for drafting our comment on Specification 13 to the dotBrand Registry Agreement that was submitted last week. Let me also thank Chris Chaplow, Tim, Marilyn, Martin and Andrew Mack for the work they did on the five-year focus. That was an extensive bit of work and some very good writing. That was submitted over the weekend as well.

There are whole chunks of that text that - to Aparna's point earlier - there's whole chunks of that text that ought to be transferrable to the work that Aparna mentioned on the four topics. And, again, the Business Constituency membership approved that submission. So Benedetta is working with Chris Chaplow to consolidate the six separate files, which are scarcely accessible on the Web, and circulate it to the BC and post it on the BC Website.

So, Benedetta, any chance you can get that done as soon as possible?

Benedetta Rossi: Yes of course, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. And send it to BC GNSO so we'll all have a copy of the consolidated document but it's of particular interest to what Aparna, Phil and Marilyn are working on. Got it.

Second thing I want to talk about is the BC participation in public comment periods. There are two of them open right now. The first is the status update - was given by that Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services. That's formally known as Whois.

Susan Kawaguchi's on that Expert Working Group and we've been very well briefed by Susan on what they're doing and we also came back with several comments. But right now they have a status update and we need to comment on that.

Jimson and Tim both volunteered to help with that and they've already begun their work. You guys are on the call. Let me turn the mic over to you to explain the approach you're taking, what input you need from BC members.

Jimson Olufuye: This is Jimson. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: We do. Go ahead, Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay great. Steve, I really want to thank you very much for giving me that (head on). We got to (unintelligible) status report. Is about 84-page, incorporate report. And (unintelligible) from BC are very useful. (Unintelligible) initial comment (consigning) the report. The team is still working on it and believe that we will be able to compare notes and then (unintelligible) come up with joint position - recommendation for BC.

Well my initial takeaway that the Expert Working Group has done a very good. Susan's group they've been quite (unintelligible). Quite robust and (unintelligible). But I think basically the BC will continue to support the recommendations and the original outlines of (unintelligible) by the Expert Working Group (unintelligible) and the new (unintelligible) access protocol.

One other area it was felt that we need to really reflect is the outcome of the (unintelligible). We saw that there is from reasonable level of (unintelligible). So that has not come out in the report (unintelligible) so I'm looking at the (unintelligible) security to kind of (unintelligible). So there are (unintelligible) work in progress that the Expert Working Group talked about and they're conduct some (unintelligible) in this area. And I think that is quite commendable.

(Unintelligible). So the Expert Working Group said they're going to do more (unintelligible) outlined and I think we should really wait more to build the outcome of that as such (unintelligible) analysis for a number of the (unintelligible)...

Steve DelBianco: Jimson, it's a tiny bit difficult to understand some of the details because of the voice connection that we're dealing with today. Let me please encourage you, Tim and Susan, to circulate your thoughts in writing by one week from today giving us the full 14-day review before it's due on the end of February.

And as we've done many times before if there are gaps in your analysis where you want to seek other input just make a notion of that in our draft comment. I'll be happy to edit the draft and take care of circulation roughly this time next week. But we can usually draw member's attention to missing areas that they can fill in during the 14-day period.

Are there any questions for Jimson and Tim right now on that project or other volunteers who want to help them? Thank you, guys, very much. Appreciate that.

And my second item is that the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, we call it ATRT2 because this is the second one, this is a review that was mandated under the Affirmation of Commitments. And it's one of the most important and permanent aspects of the Affirmation.

They have issued their final recommendations and final report and comments are due on the 21st of February for initial comments. We then have another couple of weeks until the final comments are due.

This is a significant document linked on Number 2 under Channel 1. And at this point I'm looking to call for some volunteers, other than the folks who are already heavily engaged here, to look at the ATRT recommendations and point out areas where the BC wants to support or differ from what they're recommending.

Can I have one or two volunteers who would be willing to take a look at the second ATRT report?

Marilyn Cade: Steve, it's Marilyn. Sorry, can you tell us who the volunteers are today? And...

Steve DelBianco: No, we don't - this is on the second item. We don't have any BC volunteers on this item yet.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. May I make a comment on the ATRT? And I'm not volunteering but I want to make a comment on ATRT...

Steve DelBianco: Too late. To late, I already wrote you down.

Marilyn Cade: But can I also offer - can I make a comment as well?

Steve DelBianco: Just make it quick, we're running out of time.

Marilyn Cade: I don't know if members are really aware that the ATRT2 is ignoring many of the commitments and requests that the BC asked for in previous contributions. There's a lot of a - been there, done that, been there, done that, been there, done that. I'm going to mention two areas. There is no effective repeal mechanism or you cannot recall a Board member, you cannot recall a Board decision. There's no mechanism for that. And the ATRT2 acknowledges that.

There's also an acknowledgement that the Nominating Committee process is perhaps not fully robust. Maybe we could - Steve, I can't spend a lot of time on this but if we had a few members who wanted to go through it with me and we identified three to four critical issues we could come back in on comments on just those three to four critical issues. It's 244 pages. So, you know, I'm trying to winnow this down to what we can deal with.

Steve DelBianco: No, thanks Marilyn. And whenever we tee this up we'll be able to include - I'll include links to all the BC's prior comments on the ATRT as well.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Right.

Steve DelBianco: Make it easy for us to move ahead. Any other volunteers to assist with that? All right, expect a follow up from Marilyn and I.

I had another item on policy. It is not an official public comment but the GNSO has a working group pursuant to a policy development process, or PDP, to try to decide some key questions on the accreditation process for proxy and privacy service providers. This was all kicked off with the new Registrar Accreditation Agreement, or RAA, as a temporary fix.

But in the long run ICANN will have some process of accrediting companies that provide privacy and proxy to hide or obscure the identity of a registrant in the Whois or the Directory Services Program as we're going to call it.

I attached, in the email I sent around this morning, they are seeking answers to just a handful of questions by the end of February. And there is a working group already established. I included a link to the wiki and I that working group there are several members who have BC next to their name as their affiliation.

I confess to not recognizing their names or companies so if they're BC members it'll be news to me. It looks like at this point we don't have a BC rep who has volunteered to join this Privacy Proxy Accreditation. So please, any of you that...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...rely upon Whois to investigate potential trademark infringement, criminal conduct of any kind or even just to track down people who own a domain name, if you have experience with privacy and proxy and the obligations to relay and reveal the actual identity of the registrant this is a perfect opportunity to burn just a few hours helping to answer these several questions that have come up.

Marilyn Cade: Steve...

Steve DelBianco: Can I have a volunteer with experience in dealing with privacy and proxy providers?

Marilyn Cade: Steve, sorry, it's Marilyn. We have people who are identifying themselves as Business members - Business Constituency members?

Steve DelBianco: When you declare a Statement of Interest on the ICANN Website there's a place where you put in affiliation. And folks may have - because they are businesses they may have simply clicked, "I'm a Business Constituency person." And I'm not suggesting that's improper but they just shouldn't - we just shouldn't assume that they're actually BC members.

(Emily Emanuel), (John Horton), (Justin Macy), we have (Libby Baney), (Michael Dayaya) and I don't recognize any of those names, do you, (Bennie)? Anybody recognize any of those names as BC members?

Marilyn Cade: Could we just park that and have (Bennie) explore it? I don't recognize any of those names.

Benedetta Rossi: This is Benedetta speaking. I don't recognize any of them either.

Steve DelBianco: Right. So the fact remains we do need a volunteer with experience in privacy and proxy - and this is a bite-sized obligation and the BC has been a huge leader at ICANN at trying to suggest that the obligations to relay and reveal the contact information got to be enforced by ICANN.

That's the only other policy item I had. I'm going to turn things over in a moment for Gabby and John to talk about the last Council meeting. I did want to point out the Channel 4 on my calendar, which you can scroll down to the policy calendar, I talk about the singular and plural and string objections.

Yesterday the New gTLD Program Committee met in Los Angeles face to face. First item on their agenda was what to do about inconsistent decisions on

objection over singular and plural. I have on good authority that the BC letter that was led by Andy Abrams and I has gone in and made a difference. They are taking a hard look at a process of trying to appeal decisions that are inconsistent with similar decisions already taken.

I'll let you know if I hear anything about the outcome. I also included a link to that State of the Net conference that Phil wrote about. And there's including an audio recording that you can listen to. And I think you'll be quite amazed at some of the things that Fadi Chehadé said and that the Brazilian representative said about the upcoming Brazil meeting.

And then finally on collision the BC has been very active at trying to get ICANN to pay attention to mitigation of collision between internal network domain names and the delegated second level names of new gTLDs. So if you, for instance, called your server server.office and another server at server.home those will clash and collide the minute that server is delegated in the office TLD.

There's a link in there to a place where we can put information in. I've been participating on a group that's getting together with ICANN every two weeks. In March 8-10 VeriSign is sponsoring an event in London on collisions. And finally Jim Baskin of Verizon wanted to get in and offer an idea for helping your customers and your companies handle collisions. Jim, over to you.

Jim Baskin: Thanks, Steve. I'll try to take just no more than two minutes here. Verizon's been studying our query logs for ourselves and some of our customers to assist them. And we've gotten to a point where we recognize a need for some educational - some training materials that either we, as an ISP, or other ISPs could use or our enterprise customers could use to prepare themselves and prepare their support staffs before the possible deluge of actual collisions.

And we're working to find some partners, some other companies, that would be willing to work with us to fund the development of some educational and training materials and possibly a Webinar that could be recorded and then used as an educational piece for ISPs and enterprise customers.

So if there's anybody that's in the BC that's on the call that would have any interest if you could please contact me and I can send you some more information. I also hope to get the ISPCP involved in supporting this activity. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Jim, let me invite you to send a written request similar to what you just did but send it to BC-GNSO@icann.org and that way folks who weren't on this call or need to relay it to their internal teams can do so please.

Jim Baskin: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: That's great. If there's no further questions from anyone on policy I'd like to kick it over to Gabby and John to talk about the last Council meeting as well as the next one coming up. Phil Corwin, I see your hand up.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, just two quick comments, Steve, on State of the Net. There was a brief question period at the end and I - Milton Mueller called on me, he was moderating.

And I asked Fadi - I basically said there's concern that there's so much attention being given to the Sao Paulo meeting and these - output of these strategy panels that ICANN may be losing focus on the biggest thing it's ever rolled out, which is new TLDs and how would you respond to people with those concerns?

And his answer was basically the new TLD division is on top of it and there's nothing to worry about. So I'm not sure if that's - be proven in practice but that was his official response to that question.

The other thing I wanted to just make people aware of - at least in Washington - or it may just be rumors feeding on themselves - but I keep hearing from more and more people the view that there's a significant possibility that some time this year NTIA will transfer the IANA contract permanently to ICANN and give up its counterparty function.

And I think - I'm not sure if that's true. I'm just saying I'm hearing it from a bunch of people and they may all just be spurring each other on without any credible basis. But that is making the rounds in DC and I think that would have profound implications for a lot of things if it took place.

And I think you - when you were on that panel, Steve, you made a comment about what the implications would be so I thought other BC members should be aware of it.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Phil. Appreciate that. Gabby and John, go ahead.

John Berard: This is John. Am I audible?

Steve DelBianco: You are.

John Berard: Okay. So on that last point of Phil's I will - I'll leave Washington to you folks who were there but did we not recently hear the NTIA say essentially, "Over my dead body"?

Steve DelBianco: We did not. And you should expect them to ask for global input on how to relinquish the unilateral contract authority of IANA. I would not expect a transfer but rather a dialogue on how to relinquish it and to whom.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: And then to Fadi's point on that call it complements the continued dominance of staff in the ICANN - in ICANN. And, you know, to - and I don't know that we're going to be able to push back against this. It is a concern of the GNSO Council.

There were three things that I want to talk about - that Gabby and I want to talk about that came out of the last Council meeting and one that has arisen since.

Gabby has graciously stepped up and volunteered to serve on a small group of councilors who are continuing to look at PDP improvements and also engage the GAC in early involvement. So, Gabby, you want to say something about that?

Gabriella Szlak: Yeah, just to the point although these are two different things, one is the improvements small group that we form at the Council and their main focus today is increase the pool of PDP volunteers to - and also to improve online tools and training so any of the BC members might have on that I would be happy to receive it as a member of the group.

And other one is a consultation group that is formed I the council for GAC early engagement. And this is the result of ATRT and ATRT2 and also the Board and GAC recommendations. And so now this group that is formed from members of the GAC and the Council are focusing on trying to - how the

GAC might be better engaged in this policy development processes because when they step up it's sometimes too late for many of the members who have been involved in the processes.

So they are working now on two main areas. I think this group is really important - also - both John and I think this because the consequences of the recommendations that they will give us probably might affect in general how the policy development process works.

So there's no wiki of this group but I'm following the (spread) and I'm sending all the documents that I can find so if anybody is interested in this I will be giving more feedback in the following calls. Thank you.

John Berard: Thank you, Gabby. The third item coming out of the meeting was the formation of - the reformation of a cross community working group drafting team to begin to set some terms by which cross community working groups can more efficiently be created and operate.

I am the co chair from the GNSO Council. Becky Burr has been named the co chair from the ccNSO Council. And our first call is on Monday so I'll keep you informed on that.

Now since the meeting the most significant event has been the publication of the Multistakeholder Improvement Blueprint. This is from one of the strategy panels. This instigated a fairly vigorous discussion on the Council mailing list primarily for the same reasons as were expressed by members of the BC broadly at the beginning of this call.

And there is a - there is an initiative right now to use a fair bit of the Saturday and Sunday sessions that are held to prepare for the Council meeting on

Wednesday but also to brief the GNSO broadly on issues to focus on the five strategy panels.

We understand that the strategy panels all have their own slots during the meeting. But it is the thinking of a handful of councilors - a growing handful of councilors that a more casual back and forth - a more casual Q&A might be more meaningful to get at the work of the strategy panels rather than a structured stage performance as will be the - found in the rest of the week.

I'll keep you up to date on that as well. It will influence, I think, the value of participating in the Saturday and Sunday session. And I think that is pretty much it. Gabby, did I miss anything?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Gabby and John. Appreciate that. If there's no questions from members I'll turn it over to Marilyn. Anything with respect to the Commercial Stakeholders Group that you want to add, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I have a quick update on CSG but before I do that I actually did have a question for John and Gabby. I made a comment in the earlier session that the mystical, magical, marvelous, did I use that term, should - panels are presenting advice. And we are not really able to keep up with the advice they're presenting.

Crowd-sourcing, mob-sourcing, whatever you call it is not actually appropriate to devising policy input. So I'd like Steve to suggest that we come back and had a BC conversation about - I understand the Council may want to propose in the two days that they think they control but I want to make it clear that CSG wants to have a separate session on Sunday afternoon.

This is not a criticism; I'm just saying this is a big deal. If these four panels or five panels are being presented I like the idea that there would be a cross community dialogue about the panels over the weekend before they decide that they have definitive support. Let me park that comment and come to the CSG and do a quick update.

On the CSG we have confirmation that we will do an event with two Board members that are elected from our house on Sunday morning as we have been doing. We will have then a CSG dialogue. We're looking for confirmation of the time frame on Sunday afternoon.

On Tuesday morning we will have a cross constituency breakfast. The GAC looks like they are - we're looking to confirm that but it looks like the GAC is our confirmed guest.

Then we'll have a CSG session where we focus on what we're going to say to the Board. We then go to the Board at 11:15. And then we have our BC meeting on Tuesday afternoon, which is an open session.

There will be also - we're working under the guidance of our chair, Elisa, to have informal sessions on Monday afternoon - Monday at noon and Wednesday at noon. And those have been requested. We don't have confirmation but we are working on those.

One thing we really need from all of you is will you be there in person? Or will you be there remotely? So the secretariat will be asking for that confirmation information.

What did I miss?

Steve DelBianco: That's a good setup. I appreciate that. And then, (Bennie), if you find out who's planning to attend Singapore that'll answer the question Marilyn just brought up. It's two minutes after so anxious to close the call unless anyone had any burning item of other business or a follow up to Marilyn.

Thanks, everyone very much, especially the volunteers who are working hard to lead the way. And we will talk to you again next week once we know the agenda for the next Council meeting. Thanks, everyone. Have a great day.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you.

John Berard: Thank you.

END